UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/754,123	01/09/2004	James R. Bailey	2003-0270.02	8456

21972   7590   09/01/2009
LEXMARK INTERNATIONAL, INC.
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW DEPARTMENT
740 WEST NEW CIRCLE ROAD
BLDG. 082-1
LEXINGTON, KY 40550-0999

EXAMINER
TSAI, TSUNG YIN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2624	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/01/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

blambert@lexmark.com
jpezdek@lexmark.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/754,123	BAILEY, JAMES R.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	TSUNG-YIN TSAI	2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 April 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.　　　　2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-38* is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) *7,8,20,21 and 25* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-6,9-19,22-24 and 26-38* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *24 January 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All　b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledge amendment to claims 1 and 35.

Acknowledge of canceling claims 7-8, 20 and 21. Claim 25 depend on cancel claim 20

thus is cancel as well.

Acknowledge no new IDS submitted.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's argument – Regarding Denber and Read fail to teach image scanning

area is the entire scanning surface area of the scanning device and the target area

region refers only the area of the scanning surface on which the document is placed on

pages 8-9.

Examiner's response – Denber teaches where image scanning area is the entire

scanning surface area of the scanning device in figure 2, especially part 30 (scan

platen), column 1 lines 30-35 (scan platen without document is seen as scanning whole

scanning area) and column 1 lines 45-60.

Regarding the target area region applicant argues, in the argument section, is the

whole area encompass by the document. However, the claim language does not

expressly claim this. Target area in the claim language can be seen also as the area

where text or graphic are concern and all other areas are not the target area. Upon this

view, Read discloses in figure 4, especially parts 150a-e, where the shade areas are the

target area of interest to process and the defect, the spots, are outside the target area

for processing but still in the document area.

Upon further review Denber discloses in figure 2 part 50 where spot is

determined to be completely outside information area as well as column 3 lines 55-40.

35 USC 103 – Claim Rejection

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 1, 5-6, 12, 14, 18-19, 27, 28, 29-30, 32, 34 and 35 rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Denber (US Patent Number 5,214,470) in

view of Read (6,035,072).

Denber discloses the following method and apparatus (figure 1, column 2 lines

40-67):

(1) Regarding claims 1 and 14:

- performing a defect calibration scan of an image scanning area

   (figure 2, column 1 lines 30-67. Scan is done with out the document

   in place. This is the defect calibration scan),

- the image scanning area being the entire scanning area of the

   image scanning device

[figure 2, especially part 30 (scan platen), column 1 lines 30-35

(scan platen without document is seen as scanning whole

scanning area) and column 1 lines 45-60];

- analyzing data produced from the defect calibration scan to detect

  at least one defect in at least one section of the image scanning

  area (figure 2, column 1 lines 30-67. Creation of black and white

  bitmap is the result of the analysis.); and

- generating a tag containing information representing the result of

  the defect detection for each section of the image scanning area

  having a detected defect (figure 2, column 1 lines 30-67, column 2

  lines 1-10 discloses bitmap creation with the black and white pixel

  are creation of the tags. Location determination is also the tag

  creation. Denber teaches in abstract that the platen is first scan and

  an electronic image is generated and stored which contain

  information on the location of the dirt spot or inherent defect such

  as etch marks. This suggests that the "dirt spot" is tagged with

  information such as location and even compare to see if such

  markings that are detected are see as image analysis on the

  detected spot. Further step, taught by Denber, includes determine

  whether the spot lies wholly or partially with in any information area

  of the document image. This not only related about tagging the dirt

spot regarding with information, but how it should be deal with as

shown by figure 8A-8D. Column 1 lines 65-67 disclose that

information content is form from the scan);

- determining a border (figure 7-8, column 3 lines 45-68 to column 4

  lines 1-25 discloses where figure 7 teaches regarding finding the

  perimeter of the defect target using color differences of neighboring

  pixels outside of the defect as well as spiraling clockwise along the

  perimeter of the defect, this process will carry on until the center of

  the defect is found, in this way the border of the defect is found by

  the perimeter of these different color pixels) of a target image

  region (figures 3-4 discloses the target image region of interest with

  defect) within the image scanning area (figure 2, column 1 lines 30-

  67. Scan is done with out the document in place. This is the defect

  calibration scan) based upon the information in the generated tag

  (figure 2, column 1 lines 30-67, column 2 lines 1-10 discloses

  bitmap creation with the black and white pixel are creation of the

  tags. Location determination is also the tag creation. Denber

  teaches in abstract that the platen is first scan and an electronic

  image is generated and stored which contain information on the

  location of the dirt spot or inherent defect such as etch marks. This

  suggests that the "dirt spot" is tagged with information such as

  location and even compare to see if such markings that are

detected are see as image analysis on the detected spot. Further step, taught by Denber, includes determine whether the spot lies wholly or partially with in any information area of the document image. This not only related about tagging the dirt spot regarding with information, but how it should be deal with as shown by figure 8A-8D. Column 1 lines 65-67 disclose that information content is form from the scan),

- the border (figure 8 discloses a circle, which is seen as the border that is of interest) surround the target image regions (figure 5 and 6 disclose the circle dot, this is the target image regions of interest);

- performing processing (figure 8 discloses processing of filling within the border of interest) on the target image region (figure 5 and 6 disclose the circle dot, this is the target image regions of interest) without processing regions outside (figure 8 discloses processing of filling within the border of interest) of the border (figure 8 discloses a circle, which is seen as the border that is of interest) of the target image region (figure 5 and 6 disclose the circle dot, this is the target image regions of interest).

Denber does not teach regarding the section of the image scanning area tagged as having a defect being outside the determined border of the target image region.

However, Read, in the field of mapping defect or dirt affecting scanner,

teaches the section (figure 4 discloses area of scanning for processing) of the

image scanning area (figure 4 part 206 where whole area for scanning) tagged

as having a defect (figure 4 parts 208 are the defects) being outside the

determined border (figure 4, figure 5) of the target image region (figure 4, figure

5, columns 12-13 discloses defect mapping and exclude in regions of interest).

It would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the

invention to employ Read teachings to Denber regarding defect detecting of the

scanner and excluding those defects from the scan area of interest. In this way

there is no further requirement of time require for processing of the defect since

they are not in the area of interest, thus, faster processing.

The motivation to combine such that dynamic defect detection allows

defect compensation, defect correction and alerting the operator of defects

(abstract) as well as without requiring any pristine objection of calibration (column

21 lines 20-22).

(2) Regarding claims 5 and 18:

Denber further teaches:

further comprising automatically compensating for the defect based on

information contained within the tag (figure 8a-8d, figure 7, figure 9, column 3

and 4. The spiral region technique is the method that take the given information

and corrects it.).

(3) Regarding claims 6 and 19:

Denber further teaches:

further comprising determining the nature of the defect by recursively

dividing the section of the image scanning area tagged as having a defect into

subareas and analysis each subarea in detail (figure 8a-8d, figure 7, figure 9,

column 4 lines 1-10. The figures show that the defect in the area is divided. Pixel

, which are the smallest division of the image, are than analysis one by one.).

(4) Regarding claims 12:

Denber further teaches:

further comprising smoothing over the section of the image scanning area

tagged as having a defect if that section is determined to be included in the target

image region (figure 2, figure 5, figure 6, column 2 lines 1-10, columns 3-4).

(5) Regarding claim 27:

Denber further teaches:

wherein the analyzer and the tag generator are included in the image

scanning device (column 3 lines 40-67 to column 4 lines 1-25).

(6) Regarding claim 29:

Denber further teaches:

wherein the compensator is included in the image scanning device

(column 3 lines 40-67 to column 4 lines 1-25, figure 8a-8d, figure 7, figure 9,

column 3 and 4. The technique is the compensator).

(7) Regarding claim 32:

Denber further teaches:

wherein the compensator is included in a host computer connected to the

image scanning device (column 3 lines 40-67 to column 4 lines 1-25, figure 8a-

8d, figure 7, figure 9, column 3 and 4. The compensator is within the hardware.).

(8) Regarding claim 30:

Denber further teaches:

wherein at least one of the analyzer and the tag generator are included in

a host computer connected to the image scanning device (column 3 lines 40-67

to column 4 lines 1-25, figure 8a-8d, figure 7, figure 9, column 3 and 4. All of the

hardware are within the host processor.).

(9) Regarding claim 34:

Denber further teaches:

further comprising a processor (figure 1 part 24 discloses an image

processor that carries the process of figure 2), wherein the analyzer and border

determine (figure 7-8, column 3 lines 45-68 to column 4 lines 1-25 discloses

where figure 7 teaches regarding finding the perimeter of the defect target using

color differences of neighboring pixels outside of the defect as well as spiraling

clockwise along the perimeter of the defect, this process will carry on until the

center of the defect is found, in this way the border of the defect is found by the

perimeter of these different color pixels) are performed by the processor (figure 1

discloses an image processor that carries the process).

(10) Regarding claim 35:

Denber further teaches:

performing a defect scan (figure 1, figure 2 part 30 disclose scan of document) of an image scanning area (figure 2 part 30 discloses scan of document, where document is the are of interest for scanning);

detecting at least one defect (figure 3 and 4 discloses detection of spot/defect) in at least one section (figure 2 part 42 and 50 discloses where if the spot/defect is in sections such as inside or outside) of the image scanning area (figure 2 part 30 discloses scan of document, where document is the are of interest for scanning);

performing a scan (figure 2 part 34 discloses scan) on the image scanning area (figure 2 part 30 discloses scan of document, where document is the are of interest for scanning) having a target image region (figure 2 part 38, 42 and 50 discloses scanning and processing of the target image region, which is the spot);

determining a border (figure 8A disclose the circle/border of the spot/defect) of the target image region (figure 2 part 38, 42 and 50 discloses scanning and processing of the target image region, which is the spot) within the image scanning area (figure 2 part 42 discloses where the area of interest is within) based upon a location of the defect detected (figure 3 and 4 discloses detection of spot/defect), the border (figure 8A disclose the circle/border of the spot/defect) surrounding the target image region (figure 2 part 38, 42 and 50 discloses scanning and processing of the target image region, which is the spot); and

processing the target image region (figure 2 part 38, 42 and 50 discloses

scanning and processing of the target image region, which is the spot) without

processing sections (figure 2 part 44 discloses processing of the area within the

border) of the image scanning area (figure 2 part 30 discloses scan of document,

where document is the are of interest for scanning) outside of the border (figure 2

part 42 and 44, figure 8 part A-D).

Read, in the field of mapping defect or dirt affecting scanner, teaches the

section (figure 4 discloses area of scanning for processing) of the image

scanning area (figure 4 part 206 where whole area for scanning) tagged as

having a defect (figure 4 parts 208 are the defects) being outside the determined

border (figure 4, figure 5) of the target image region (figure 4, figure 5, columns

12-13 discloses defect mapping and exclude in regions of interest).

4.   Claims 2-4,10-11, 15-17, 23-24, 28, 31 and 36 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Denber (US Patent Number 5,214,470) in

view of Peairs et al (US Patent Number 5,694,228).

Denber discloses all that is above except the following:

(1) Regarding claims 2 and 15:

wherein the defect calibration scan data is performed on the occurrence of

at least one of the group of events comprising when the image scanning device

is powered up upon request by a user, and periodically.

Peairs et al in the same field of endeavor disclose wherein the defect

calibration scan data is performed on the occurrence of at least one of the group

of events comprising when the image scanning device is powered up upon

request by a user, and periodically (figure 1, figure 2, column 2 lines 5-20,

column 3 lines 45-55).

It would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the

invention to employ Peairs et al teaching to Denber to scan the defect calibration

scan data is performed on the occurrence of at least one of the group of events

comprising when the image scanning device is powered up upon request by a

user, and periodically. Such that tags database would be readily up-to-date and

would be ready to be use any time that is requested.

(2) Regarding claims 3 and 16:

further comprising storing the tag.

Peairs et al in the same field of endeavor disclose further comprising

storing the tag (figure 1, figure 2, column 2 lines 5-15, column 2 lines 35-40,

column 4 table 1, figure 7, figure 9.).

It would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the

invention to employ Peairs et al teaching to Denber to further comprising storing

the tag. Such that the detection will know the location and tags database would

be readily up-to-date and would be ready to be use any time that is requested.

(3) Regarding claims 4 and 17:

further comprising repeating the steps of performing the defect calibration scanning, analyzing defect calibration scan data to detect for a new defect and a change in any previously detected defect, generating and storing a tag for each new detected defect, and updating the stored tag for each previously detected defect that has changed.

Peairs et al in the same field of endeavor disclose further comprising repeating the steps of performing the defect calibration scanning, analyzing defect calibration scan data to detect for a new defect and a change in any previously detected defect, generating and storing a tag for each new detected defect, and updating the stored tag for each previously detected defect that has changed (figure 1, figure 2, column 2 lines 10-20, column 3 lines 45-55. New defects are noted and their location and values are store and update to the tag database.).

It would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ Peairs et al teaching to Denber further comprising repeating the steps of performing the defect calibration scanning, analyzing defect calibration scan data to detect for a new defect and a change in any previously detected defect, generating and storing a tag for each new detected defect, and updating the stored tag for each previously detected defect that has change. Such that tags database would be readily up-to-date and would be ready to be use any time that is requested.

(4) Regarding claims 10, 23 and 36:

Denber teaches regarding based upon the border determination (figure 7-8, column 3 lines 45-68 to column 4 lines 1-25 discloses where figure 7 teaches regarding finding the perimeter of the defect target using color differences of neighboring pixels outside of the defect as well as spiraling clockwise along the perimeter of the defect, this process will carry on until the center of the defect is found, in this way the border of the defect is found by the perimeter of these different color pixels)

Denber does not teach regarding:

further comprising cloning the target image to produce multiple target images over the image scanning area.

Peairs et al in the same field of endeavor disclose wherein the section of the image scanning area tagged as having a defect is ignored in cloning the target image to produce multiple target images over the image scanning area (figure 1, figure 2, column 3 lines50-67 to column 4 lines 1-2. Office copier is the "cloner" that will output the multi image ignoring the defect area.).

It would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ Peairs et al teaching to Denber wherein the section of the image scanning area tagged as having a defect is ignored in cloning the target image to produce multiple target images over the image scanning area. Such would be the efficiency and faster way of making copies of the target image.

(6) Regarding claim 28:

Denber teaches all the subject matter above.

Denber does not teach regarding wherein the memory is included in the image scanning device.

Peairs et al in the same field of endeavor disclose wherein the memory is included in the image scanning device (figure 1, figure 2).

It would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ Peairs et al teaching to Denber wherein the memory is included in the image scanning device. Such that the design would be cumulative feature and such feature of including memory within would make the process faster.

(7) Regarding claim 31:

Denber teaches all the subject matter above.

Denber does not teach regarding wherein the memory is included in a host computer connected to the image scanning device.

Peairs et al in the same field of endeavor disclose wherein the memory is included in a host computer connected to the image scanning device (figure 1, figure 2).

It would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ Peairs et al teaching to Denber wherein the memory is included in a host computer connected to the image scanning device. Such that the design would be cumulative feature and such feature of including memory within would make the process faster.

1.   Claims 9, 22 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Denber (US Patent Number 5,214,470) in view Miura et al (US 2003/0002580 A1).

(1) Regarding claims 9, 22 and 37:

Denber teaches the following subject matter:

further comprising autofitting the target image region to the image

scanning area (figure 2, figure 5, figure 6, column 2 lines 1-10, column 3 lines 55-

65) based upon the border determination (figure 7-8, column 3 lines 45-68 to

column 4 lines 1-25 discloses where figure 7 teaches regarding finding the

perimeter of the defect target using color differences of neighboring pixels

outside of the defect as well as spiraling clockwise along the perimeter of the

defect, this process will carry on until the center of the defect is found, in this way

the border of the defect is found by the perimeter of these different color pixels).

Denber does not teach regarding to autofitting of the target image region.

However, Miura et al regarding the autofitting of the target image region

(figure 19 discloses target image region or the defect area is display and enlarge

for viewing. Page 7 paragraph 0095-0099 discloses image of defect is enlarge in

the display section while mainly focusing on the defect image, this is seen as

autofitting as define by the specification by the applicant).

It would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the

invention to employ Miura et al teachings to Denber regarding further enhancing

the viewing of the detail of a detected defect for further analysis.

The motivation to combine such that the defect image obtain by the inspection and autofit will enable the observing of the state of each defect in detail (page 8 paragraph 0099).

2.   Claim 11, 24 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Denber (US Patent Number 5,214,470) and Peairs et al (US Patent Number 5,694,228) further in view of Miura et al (US 2003/0002580 A1).

(5) Regarding claims 11, 24 and 38:

Denber teaches regarding based upon the border determination (figure 7-8, column 3 lines 45-68 to column 4 lines 1-25 discloses where figure 7 teaches regarding finding the perimeter of the defect target using color differences of neighboring pixels outside of the defect as well as spiraling clockwise along the perimeter of the defect, this process will carry on until the center of the defect is found, in this way the border of the defect is found by the perimeter of these different color pixels)

Peairs et al in the same field of endeavor disclose wherein the section of the image scanning area tagged is having a defect is ignored in enlarging the target image to fit across multiple image scanning areas (figure 1, figure 2, column 3 lines50-67 to column 4 lines 1-2. Copier not only have the ability to copy, but also edit and change the image, in this case enlarging or blow up the image from original size.).

However, Miura et al regarding the enlarging of the target image region (figure 19 discloses target image region or the defect area is display and enlarge for viewing. Page 7 paragraph 0095-0099 discloses image of defect is enlarge in the display section while mainly focusing on the defect image, this is seen as enlarging as define by the specification by the applicant).

It would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ Miura et al teachings to Denber regarding further enhancing the viewing of the detail of a detected defect for further analysis.

The motivation to combine such that the defect image obtains by the inspection and enlarging will enable the observing of the state of each defect in detail (page 8 paragraph 0099).

5.   Claims 13 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Denber (US Patent Number 5,214,470) in view of Xu et al (US Patent Number 5,761,336).

Denber discloses all that is above except the following:

(1) Regarding claims 13 and 26:

Denber teaches all the subject matter above.

Denber does not teach regarding wherein the defect calibration scan is a low resolution.

Xu et al in the same field of endeavor disclose wherein the defect

calibration scan is a low resolution (figure 1, column 4 lines 10-42, column 5 lines

65-67 to column 6 lines 1-10.)

It would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the

invention to employ Xu et al teaching to Denber wherein the defect calibration

scan is a low resolution. Such the defect calibration scan will a quick update for

the tag database and low resolution scanning would increase depth of focus

providing superior defect detection and classification.

6.   Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Denber

(US Patent Number 5,214,470) in view of Sampath et al (US Patent Number 6,665,425

B1).

(13) Regarding claim 33:

Denber teaches regarding the apparatus (figure 1 discloses apparatus)

Denber does not teach regarding multifunction device having a printer and

scanner.

However, Sampath et al teaches where this multifunction device having a

printer and scanner (figures 2-7 disclose where the system comprises of printer

and scanner, column 3 lines 45-68 discloses a multifunction device having a

printer and scanner).

It would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the

invention to employ Sampath et al teaching to Denber regarding multifunction

device having a printer and scanner, such the motivation to combine so all the

part of the system can exercised appropriately to extract useful diagnostic

information that will be same for all the part of the system, printer and scanner,

for normal machine operation mode (column 3 lines 45-68 to column 4 lines 1-

10).

Conclusion

3.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Samir Ahmed can be reached on (571)272-7413. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Tsung-Yin Tsai/

Examiner, Art Unit 2624

August 19, 2009

/Samir A. Ahmed/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2624